

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 7-24 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1-6 were canceled by previous amendment, and claim 10 is hereby canceled without prejudice. Claims 7, 15 and 16 are amended. No new matter is introduced herein.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph because Figure 3 does not show more than one optical member.

First, claim 24 does not include the term/phrase “at least one optical member.” Accordingly, Applicants interpret this rejection as rejecting claims 7 and 15 (not 7 and 24 as recited in the Office Action).

Second, 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, does not require that the drawings, themselves, show every feature of the claims, but that the specification describe the claimed invention “in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention.” See, e.g., MPEP 2163I. Applicants’ specification describes at least one optical lens 2'' (e.g., at page 5, lines 1-2). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of claims 7 and 15. Further, because claims 8, 9, 11-14 and

16-24 each depend from one of claims 7 and 15, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection of these claims as well for at least the same reasons as claims 7 and 15.

Claim 10 is also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not describe the image sensor and optical member as being adjacent. Claim 10 has been canceled, thereby obviating its rejection.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 7-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Saari et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,035). In the Office Action, the Examiner comments that while claim 15 recites that the reflecting member is rotatable about an optical axis of the image sensor, claim 7 recites that the reflecting member is rotatable around an optical axis of the image sensor. Further, the Examiner interprets “around” to mean “in the vicinity of.” Because the Examiner believes that the mirror 84 in Saari Figure 10 rotates in the vicinity of the optical axis, the Examiner believes that claim 7 reads on Saari.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite “the reflecting member...being rotatable about the optical axis of the image sensor” (emphasis added). Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over Saari. Further, because claims 8-14 depend from claim 7, they are also patentable over Saari for at least the same reasons as claim 7.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 7-14.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 15, 16 and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sladen et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0061767) and Saari. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Sladen, Saari and Robb (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,950). Applicants respectfully submit, however, that these claims are patentable over Sladen, Saari, and any combination thereof.

Claim 15 recites in part “the reflecting member and the at least one optical member being rotatable about the optical axis of the image sensor.”

Sladen discloses an imaging system for a mobile phone. The imaging system includes a digital camera, a lens and a rotatable mirror. In the embodiments shown in Figures 14 and 15, the mirror 1430 appears to be rotatable about the optical axis of the video camera 1420. Figures 14 and 15 do not, however, show an optical member. More specifically, Sladen does not disclose a mirror and an optical member that are “rotatable about the optical axis of the image sensor,” as recited in amended claim 15 (emphasis added).

Saari discloses an imaging system including a mirror 84 that rotates about a pivot point 86 (FIG. 10). However, the pivot point 86 is not located on the optical

axis of the image sensor 72 and, therefore, the mirror does not rotate about the optical axis of the image sensor. Further, the lens 70 does not rotate. Thus, Saari also does not disclose a mirror and an optical member that are "rotatable about the optical axis of the image sensor," as recited in amended claim 15.

Robb discloses connecting a printed circuit board (PCB 91) to a motherboard 100 via an electrical circuit ribbon 118. Robb does not make up for the deficiencies of Sladen and Sarri, as set forth above

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14, claim 15 is patentable over Sladen, Sarri, Robb, and any combination thereof.

Claims 16-24 are also patentable over Sladen, Sarri, and any combination thereof, at least because of their dependencies from patentable claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 15-24.

Applicant: Durand et al.
Application No.: 10/583,486

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephonic interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and request a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorand et al.

By: /Thomas A. Mattioli/
Thomas A. Mattioli
Registration No. 56,773

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4009
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

DCK/TAM/dcb
Enclosure